UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/822,347	04/12/2004	Malcolm Erik Pearson	13768.504	3119

22913 7590 02/04/2009

Workman Nydegger
1000 Eagle Gate Tower
60 East South Temple
Salt Lake City, UT 84111

EXAMINER	
MADAMBA, GLENFORD J	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2451	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
02/04/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/822,347	PEARSON ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Glenford Madamba	2451	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *20 November 2008*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-12 and 24-34* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-12 and 24-34* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Remarks and Amendments

1. This action is in response to remarks and claim amendments filed by Applicant's representative on November 20, 2008.

2. Applicant's remarks and claim amendments filed on November 20, 2008 have been considered but are now moot in light of the new grounds of rejection provided with this action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1, 3-12, 24, and 26-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Smith, U.S. Patent Publication US 2002/0152399 A1 in view of

Gilbert et al (hereinafter Gilbert), U.S. Patent 5,530,848 and in further view of Spies et al (hereinafter Spies), U.S. Patent Publication US 2005/0138353 A1.

As per Claims 1 and 24, Smith in view of Gilbert and in further view of Spies discloses in a computer system with a message processor, a method of processing at least a portion of a message where an attempt to previously process the message failed, the method comprising the acts of:

the computer system logging state information corresponding to each of a plurality of received messages to a log of state information (Gilbert: 'Log File 22' generated by Transaction Processing System Log File 128 / Communications Log File 126) [Figure 1], wherein logged state information includes an identity of each of the plurality of received messages and the state information identifying the status of each of the plurality of received messages at the time the state information was logged (Gilbert: e.g., Log state "PN" / "PO" , Log state "PR" / "PS", Log state "PX" / "PY", or Log state "PQ") (Table 1) [col 7, L45-52] [col 8, L1-15] (Log File 128 'Status", such as Status "1"..."X") [Fig. 21] and including a start state indicating the message processor is attempting to process the message (Gilbert: e.g., 'startup time stamp') [Fig. 13] and a state indicating whether the message processor completed processing of the message (e.g, storing message w/ log state "PR" / "PS" or with log state "PX" / "PY") (Table 1) [col 7, L45-52] [col 8, L1-15] (Log File 128 'Status", such as Status "1"...."X") [Fig. 21];

subsequent to logging the sate information, the computer system accessing the log of state information (Gilbert: e.g., querying / interrogating Log File_208 generated by

Transaction Processing System Log File 128 / Communications Log File 126) [Figure 1] and identifying a message indicated as being processed by the message processor for which completion is not indicated, thereby indicating that the message previously failed to process (Spies: e.g., 'type' of Processed Message => message is 'Acceptable' / 'unacceptable'_160) (e.g., blocking / editing and archiving of the 'processed message', and generating any alerts / notifications) [Fig. 8, 10, 11 & 12]; and

in response to identifying the message previously failed to process, the computer system logging a second state information (Spies: e.g., 'type' of Processed Message alerts, and other 'actions') [Fig. 10] the log of state information indicating that the message is being de-featured according to a *first rule* (Spies: e.g., "Process Message according to Message Attributes and Policy Rules_90 {including (a) 'scanning for viruses', (b) scanning for spam, (c) examining message for 'compliance' with policies / rules, (d) generating notifications, (e) 'blocking' or *'editing'* the message, (f) redirecting the message, and g) 'archiving' the message, etc.}) [Fig. 8], removing a portion of the message to increase the likelihood of the message processor being able to appropriately process the message (Smith: e.g., removing the 'exploits' 635) [Fig. 6]; and attempting to *reprocess* the message subsequent to removing the portion of the message (Smith: e.g., "Exploits found?" -> if no, then 'forward' original message {or 'cleaned' message} towards recipient 640) [Fig. 6].

While Smith discloses substantial features of the invention such as the method of claim 1 above, the additionally recited features of the method further comprising the computer system logging state information corresponding to each of a plurality of received messages to a log of state information, wherein logged state information includes an identity of each of the plurality of received messages and the state information identifying the status of each of the plurality of received messages at the time the state information was logged and including a start state indicating the message processor is attempting to process the message and a state indicating whether the message processor completed processing of the message; and subsequent to logging the sate information, the computer system accessing the log of state information are disclosed by Gilbert in a related endeavor.

Gilbert discloses as his invention a method and system for interfacing external processes to a *transaction processing system*. An interface system is provided that accepts input messages from external messages wherein the input messages are to be processed by the transaction processing system [Abstract] [col 3, L24-47]. Specifically, Gilbert discloses the additionally recited features of the method further comprising the computer system logging state information corresponding to each of a plurality of received messages to a log of state information (Gilbert: 'Log File 22' created / generated by Transaction Processing System Log File 128 / Communications Log File 126) [Figure 1], wherein logged state information includes an identity of each of the

plurality of received messages (e.g., Log Control Record of message) and the state information identifying the *status* of each of the plurality of received messages at the time the state information was logged (Gilbert: e.g., Log state "PN" / "PO" => message w/ Control Record identifier is 'actively being processed', Log state "PR" / "PS" => message w/ Control Record identifier processing 'finished successfully', Log state "PX" / "PY" => message w/ Control Record identifier processing 'finished with error', or Log state "PQ" => message w/ Control Record identifier 'awaiting to be processed') (Table 1) [col 7, L45-52] [col 8, L1-15] (Log File 128 'Status", such as Status "1"..."X") [Fig. 21] and including a start state indicating the message processor is attempting to process the message (e.g., 'startup time stamp') [Fig. 13] and a state indicating whether the message processor completed processing of the message (e.g, storing message w/ log state "PR" / "PS" => message w/ Control Record identifier processing 'finished successfully' or storing message with log state "PX" / "PY" => message w/ Control Record identifier processing 'finished with error') (Table 1) [col 7, L45-52] [col 8, L1-15] (Log File 128 'Status", such as Status "1"–> "X") [Fig. 21]; and subsequent to logging the sate information, the computer system accessing the log of state information (Gilbert: e.g., querying / interrogating Log File_208 generated by Transaction Processing System Log File 128 / Communications Log File 126) [Figure 1].

It would thus be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine and/or modify Smith's invention with the above said additional features , as disclosed by Gilbert, for the motivation of providing a method and system including an interface to a system that provides acknowledgment to external

applications upon receipt of a message, and provides tracking and management of the message as it is processed through the transaction processing system [col 3, L4-20].

Further, with regards to the claim, while the combination of Smith and Gilbert disclose substantial features of the invention, as above, the additional recited features of the method further comprising identifying a message indicated as being processed by the message processor for which completion is not indicated, thereby indicating that the message previously failed to process; and in response to identifying the message previously failed to process, the computer system logging a second state information the log of state information indicating that the message is being de-featured according to a *first rule* are disclosed by Spies in a related endeavor.

Spies discloses as his invention systems and methods for managing messages (e.g., email messages). Messages may be scanned for compliance to a message processing policy / rule with regards to 'viruses', 'spam', encryption / decryption, or 'sensitive content' [Abstract] [0010-0012] [Figs. 8, 10, 11 & 12]. Specifically, Spies discloses the additionally recited features of the method further comprising identifying a message indicated as being processed by the message processor for which completion is not indicated, thereby indicating that the message previously failed to process (Spies: e.g., 'type' of Processed Message => message is 'Acceptable' / 'unacceptable'_160) (e.g., blocking / editing and archiving of the 'processed message', and generating any alerts / notifications) [Fig. 8, 10, 11 & 12]; and in response to identifying the message previously failed to process, the computer system logging a second state information (Spies: e.g., 'type' of Processed Message alerts, and other 'actions') [Fig. 10] the log of

state information indicating that the message is being de-featured according to a *first rule* (Spies: e.g., "Process Message according to Message Attributes and Policy Rules_90 {including (a) 'scanning for viruses', (b) scanning for spam, (c) examining message for 'compliance' with policies / rules, (d) generating notifications, (e) 'blocking' or *'editing'* the message, (f) redirecting the message, and g) 'archiving' the message, etc.}) [Fig. 8]

It would thus be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the combination of Smith and Gilbert with the above said additional features, as disclosed by Spies, for the motivation of providing a message management system with the ability to handle encrypted messages, as well as methods for using such systems to manage the messages [0009-010].

Claim 24 recites the same limitations as claim 1, are distinguished only by statutory category, and thus rejected on the same basis.

As per Claim 3, Smith discloses the method of claim 2, wherein the identifier is a hash of the message (i.e., hash) [0067].

As per Claims 4 and 26, Smith discloses the method of claim 2, wherein the message is one of an e-mail message, SOAP message, messaging board post, web message, or

instant message (e.g., email messages) [0003].

As per Claims 5 and 27, Smith in view of Gilbert and in further view of Spies discloses the method of claim 1, wherein the attempt to reprocess the message fails, the method further comprising the acts of:

subsequent to logging the sate information, accessing the log of state information (Gilbert: e.g., querying / interrogating Log File_208 generated by Transaction Processing System Log File 128 / Communications Log File 126) [Figure 1] and identifying a message indicated as being processed by the message processor for which completion is not indicated, thereby indicating that the message previously failed to reprocess (Spies: e.g., determining the 'type' of Processed Message => message is 'Acceptable' / 'unacceptable'_160) (e.g., blocking / 'editing' and archiving of the 'processed message', and generating any necessary alerts / notifications) [Fig. 8, 10, 11 & 12]

logging a third state information to the log of state information indicating that the message is being de-featured according to a second rule (Spies: e.g., "Process Message according to Message Attributes and *Policy Rules_90* {including (a) 'scanning for viruses', (b) scanning for spam, (c) examining message for 'compliance' with policies / rules, (d) generating notifications, (e) 'blocking' or *'editing'* the message, (f) redirecting the message, and g) 'archiving' the message, etc.}) [Fig. 8]

removing a second portion of the message to increase the likelihood of the message processor being able to appropriately process the message (Spies: e.g., "Process Message according to Message Attributes and *Policy Rules_90* {including (a) 'scanning for viruses', (b) scanning for spam, (c) examining message for 'compliance' with policies / rules, (d) generating notifications, (e) 'blocking' or *'editing'* the message, (f) redirecting the message, and g) 'archiving' the message, etc.}) [Fig. 8]; and

attempting to reprocess the message subsequent to removing the second portion of the message (Spies: e.g., determining the 'type' of Processed Message => message is 'Acceptable' / 'unacceptable'_160, and transmitting the message when it is considered to be 'Acceptable') [Figs. 8,10,11,12]

While Smith discloses substantial features of the invention such as the method of claim 1 above, the additionally recited features of the method further comprising subsequent to logging the sate information, accessing the log of state information is disclosed by Gilbert in a related endeavor.

Gilbert discloses as his invention a method and system for interfacing external processes to a *transaction processing system*. An interface system is provided that accepts input messages from external messages wherein the input messages are to be processed by the transaction processing system [Abstract] [col 3, L24-47]. Specifically, Gilbert discloses the additionally recited features of the method further comprising subsequent to logging the sate information, accessing the log of state information (Gilbert: e.g., querying / interrogating Log File_208 generated by Transaction Processing System Log File 128 / Communications Log File 126) [Figure 1].

It would thus be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine and/or modify Smith's invention with the above said additional features , as disclosed by Gilbert, for the motivation of providing a method and system including an interface to a system that provides acknowledgment to external applications upon receipt of a message, and provides tracking and management of the message as it is processed through the transaction processing system [col 3, L4-20].

Further, with regards to the claim, while the combination of Smith and Gilbert disclose substantial features of the invention, as above, the additional recited features of the method further comprising identifying a message indicated as being processed by the message processor for which completion is not indicated, thereby indicating that the message previously failed to reprocess logging a third state information to the log of state information indicating that the message is being de-featured according to a second rule; removing a second portion of the message to increase the likelihood of the message processor being able to appropriately process the message; and

attempting to reprocess the message subsequent to removing the second portion of the message are disclosed by Spies in a related endeavor.

Spies discloses as his invention systems and methods for managing messages (e.g., email messages). Messages may be scanned for compliance to a message processing policy / rule with regards to 'viruses', 'spam', encryption / decryption, or 'sensitive content' [Abstract] [0010-0012] [Figs. 8, 10, 11 & 12]. Specifically, Spies discloses the additionally recited features of the method further comprising identifying a

message indicated as being processed by the message processor for which completion is not indicated, thereby indicating that the message previously failed to reprocess (Spies: e.g., determining 'type' of *Processed Message* => message is 'Acceptable' / 'unacceptable'_160) (e.g., blocking / 'editing' and archiving of the 'processed message', and generating any alerts / notifications) [Fig. 8, 10, 11 & 12]; logging a third state information to the log of state information indicating that the message is being de-featured according to a second rule (Spies: e.g., "Process Message according to Message Attributes and *Policy Rules_90* {including (a) 'scanning for viruses', (b) scanning for spam, (c) examining message for 'compliance' with policies / rules, (d) generating notifications, (e) 'blocking' or *'editing'* the message, (f) redirecting the message, and g) 'archiving' the message, etc.}) [Fig. 8] removing a second portion of the message to increase the likelihood of the message processor being able to appropriately process the message (Spies: e.g., "Process Message according to Message Attributes and *Policy Rules_90* {including (a) 'scanning for viruses', (b) scanning for spam, (c) examining message for 'compliance' with policies / rules, (d) generating notifications, (e) 'blocking' or *'editing'* the message, (f) redirecting the message, and g) 'archiving' the message, etc.}) [Fig. 8]; and attempting to reprocess the message subsequent to removing the second portion of the message (Spies: e.g., determining the 'type' of Processed Message => message is 'Acceptable' / 'unacceptable'_160, and transmitting the message when it is considered to be 'Acceptable') [Figs. 8,10,11,12]

It would thus be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the combination of Smith and Gilbert with the above said additional features, as disclosed by Spies, for the motivation of providing a message management system with the ability to handle encrypted messages, as well as methods for using such systems to manage the messages [0009-010].

As per Claims 6 and 28, Smith discloses the method of claim 5, wherein the message processing state information also includes information about the portion of the message removed (e.g., virus) [0004] (e.g., "message too long") [0066].

As per Claims 7 and 29, Smith discloses the method of claim 5, wherein the second portion of the message removed includes the portion of the message removed (e.g., header, body, attachment containing the 'exploit' or rule violation) [0066].

As per Claims 8 and 30, Smith discloses the method of claim 1, wherein the first rule is based on the type of content within the portion of the message removed (e.g., message field 'standards' / rules, such as 'permissible' length of the field and/or attachments 'permissible') [0066].

As per Claims 9 and 31, Smith discloses the method of claim 8, wherein the type of content within the portion of the message removed is one or more of an alternative

format of the message, video data, audio data, image data, text, header information, or executable instructions (e.g., pictures, sound files, executable programs, etc.) [0003].

As per Claims 10 and 32, Smith discloses the method of claim 8, wherein the rules are defined by the transport protocol for the message, which is one of STMP, HTTP, TCP, UDP, or SOAP (i.e, HTTP) [0052].

As per Claim 11, Smith discloses the method of claim 8, wherein the rules are defined by content format MIME, and wherein the content of the portion of the message removed is one or more of a mixed multipart data, alternative multipart data, parallel multipart data, digest multipart data, application data, video data, audio data, image data, text, header information or the message itself (i.e., MIME) [0070].

As per Claim 12, Smith in view of Gilbert discloses the method of claim 2, wherein utilizing the state information logged for the message to identify whether the message previously failed to process comprises accessing the state information log and determining if state information exists indicating that the message successfully processed.

While Smith discloses substantial features of the invention such as the method of claim 1 above, the additionally recited features of the method further comprising logging state information corresponding to the message to a log of state information, wherein

the state information identifies the status of the message at the time the state information was logged (for example, 1st log state information, 2nd log state information, etc.); and accessing the log of state information and utilizing the state information logged for the message to identify whether the message previously failed to process are disclosed by Gilbert in a related endeavor.

Gilbert discloses as his invention a method and system for interfacing external processes to a *transaction processing system*. An interface system is provided that accepts input messages from external messages wherein the input messages are to be processed by the transaction processing system [Abstract] [col 3, L24-47]. Specifically, Gilbert discloses the additionally recited features of the method further comprising logging state information corresponding to the message to a log of state information (Log File 22 generated by Transaction Processing System Log File 128 / Communications Log File 126) [Figure 1], wherein the state information identifies the status of the message at the time the state information was logged (e.g., Message processed 'successfully', 'with error', or 'awaiting to be processed') (Table 1) [col 8, L1-15] (Log File 128 'Status", such as Status "1"– "X") [Fig. 21]; and accessing the log of state information and utilizing the state information logged for the message to identify whether the message previously failed to process (e.g., updating of control records 148 based on information whether processing of a message is 'complete)' [col 8, L47-57]

It would thus be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine and/or modify Smith's invention with the above said additional features , as disclosed by Gilbert, for the motivation of providing a method and system

including an interface to a system that provides acknowledgment to external applications upon receipt of a message, and provides tracking and management of the message as it is processed through the transaction processing system [col 3, L4-20].

As per claim 33, Smith in view of Gilbert discloses the method of claim 1 further comprising the act of periodically scanning the log of state information in order to find messages that have not processed successfully.

While Smith discloses substantial features of the invention such as the method of claim 1 above, the additionally recited features of the method further comprising logging state information corresponding to the message to a log of state information, wherein the state information identifies the status of the message at the time the state information was logged (for example, 1st log state information, 2nd log state information, etc.); and accessing the log of state information and utilizing the state information logged for the message to identify whether the message previously failed to process are disclosed by Gilbert in a related endeavor.

Gilbert discloses as his invention a method and system for interfacing external processes to a *transaction processing system*. An interface system is provided that accepts input messages from external messages wherein the input messages are to be processed by the transaction processing system [Abstract] [col 3, L24-47]. Specifically, Gilbert discloses the additionally recited features of the method further comprising logging state information corresponding to the message to a log of state information (Log File 22 generated by Transaction Processing System Log File 128 /

Communications Log File 126) [Figure 1], wherein the state information identifies the status of the message at the time the state information was logged (e.g., Message processed 'successfully', 'with error', or 'awaiting to be processed') (Table 1) [col 8, L1-15] (Log File 128 'Status", such as Status "1"– "X") [Fig. 21]; and accessing the log of state information and utilizing the state information logged for the message to identify whether the message previously failed to process (e.g., updating of control records 148 based on information whether processing of a message is 'complete)' [col 8, L47-57]. Gilbert additionally and expressly discloses the recited feature of 'periodically scanning the log of state information in order to find messages that have not processed successfully' (i.e., "...periodically examines the status of each message as it is being processed..." [Abstract] (i.e., "scanning log file 122") [col 8, L51-54]

It would thus be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine and/or modify Smith's invention with the above said additional features, as disclosed by Gilbert, for the motivation of providing a method and system including an interface to a system that provides acknowledgment to external applications upon receipt of a message, and provides tracking and management of the message as it is processed through the transaction processing system [col 3, L4-20].

As per claim 34, Smith in view of Gilbert discloses the method of claim 1 further comprising the act of scanning the log of state information in order to find messages

that have not processed successfully in response to an event comprising one of (1) system reboot, (2) process restart, or (3) thread restart.

While Smith discloses substantial features of the invention such as the method of claim 1 above, the additionally recited features of the method further comprising logging state information corresponding to the message to a log of state information, wherein the state information identifies the status of the message at the time the state information was logged (for example, 1st log state information, 2nd log state information, etc.); and accessing the log of state information and utilizing the state information logged for the message to identify whether the message previously failed to process are disclosed by Gilbert in a related endeavor.

Gilbert discloses as his invention a method and system for interfacing external processes to a *transaction processing system*. An interface system is provided that accepts input messages from external messages wherein the input messages are to be processed by the transaction processing system [Abstract] [col 3, L24-47]. Specifically, Gilbert discloses the additionally recited features of the method further comprising logging state information corresponding to the message to a log of state information (Log File 22 generated by Transaction Processing System Log File 128 / Communications Log File 126) [Figure 1], wherein the state information identifies the status of the message at the time the state information was logged (e.g., Message processed 'successfully', 'with error', or 'awaiting to be processed') (Table 1) [col 8, L1-15] (Log File 128 'Status", such as Status "1"– "X") [Fig. 21]; and accessing the log of state information and utilizing the state information logged for the message to identify

whether the message previously failed to process (e.g., updating of control records 148 based on information whether processing of a message is 'complete)' [col 8, L47-57]. Gilbert additionally and expressly discloses the recited feature of 'periodically scanning the log of state information in order to find messages that have not processed successfully' (i.e., "...periodically examines the status of each message as it is being processed..." [Abstract] (i.e., "scanning log file 122") [col 8, L51-54] (e.g., "...the interface system is *event-driven*") [Abstract] [col 7, L42-44].

It would thus be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine and/or modify Smith's invention with the above said additional features, as disclosed by Gilbert, for the motivation of providing a method and system including an interface to a system that provides acknowledgment to external applications upon receipt of a message, and provides tracking and management of the message as it is processed through the transaction processing system [col 3, L4-20].

3. Claims 2 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Smith, U.S. Patent Publication US 2002/0152399 A1 Gilbert et al (hereinafter Gilbert), U.S. Patent 5,530,848 and in further view of Callas et al (hereinafter Callas), U.S. Patent Publication US 2006/0015736 A1.

As per Claims 2 and 25, Smith in view of Gilbert and in further view of Spies and Callas discloses the method of claim 1, further comprising the acts of:

the computer receiving a new message (610) [Fig. 6];

the computer generating an identifier for the new message (Callas: e.g., 'message-id') [0048];

the computer system checking the state log (Gilbert: e.g., the system periodically examines the status of each message as it is being processed by the transaction processing system) [Abstract] to determine if a start state exists for the new message (Gilbert: e.g., 'startup time stamp') [Fig. 13];

upon determination that no start state exists for the new message, the computer system logging the identifier for the new message and an indication that the processing of the new message has started (Gilbert: e.g., "Active" Control Record with status "PN", "PO" or "PM") [Table 1] [col 7, L50-52]; and

the computer system attempting to process the new message, and logging state information indicating that the message successfully processed only in response to the new message completing successfully (Spies: e.g., 'type' of Processed Message => message is 'Acceptable' / 'unacceptable'_160) (e.g., blocking / editing and archiving of the 'processed message', and generating any alerts / notifications) [Fig. 8, 10, 11 & 12].

.

While Smith discloses substantial features of the invention such as the method of claim 1 above, the additionally recited features of the method further comprising the computer system checking the state log to determine if a start state exists for the new message; and upon determination that no start state exists for the new message, the

computer system logging the identifier for the new message and an indication that the processing of the new message has started is disclosed by Gilbert in a related endeavor.

Gilbert discloses as his invention a method and system for interfacing external processes to a *transaction processing system*. An interface system is provided that accepts input messages from external messages wherein the input messages are to be processed by the transaction processing system [Abstract] [col 3, L24-47]. Specifically, Gilbert discloses the additionally recited features of the method further comprising the computer system checking the state log (Gilbert: e.g., the system periodically examines the status of each message as it is being processed by the transaction processing system) [Abstract] to determine if a start state exists for the new message (Gilbert: e.g., 'startup time stamp') [Fig. 13]; and upon determination that no start state exists for the new message, the computer system logging the identifier for the new message and an indication that the processing of the new message has started (Gilbert: e.g., "Active" Control Record with status "PN", "PO" or "PM") [Table 1] [col 7, L50-52].

It would thus be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine and/or modify Smith's invention with the above said additional features , as disclosed by Gilbert, for the motivation of providing a method and system including an interface to a system that provides acknowledgment to external applications upon receipt of a message, and provides tracking and management of the message as it is processed through the transaction processing system [col 3, L4-20].

Further, with regards to the claim, while the combination of Smith and Gilbert disclose substantial features of the invention, as above, the additional recited features of the method further comprising the computer system attempting to process the new message, and logging state information indicating that the message successfully processed only in response to the new message completing successfully is disclosed by Spies in a related endeavor.

Spies discloses as his invention systems and methods for managing messages (e.g., email messages). Messages may be scanned for compliance to a message processing policy / rule with regards to 'viruses', 'spam', encryption / decryption, or 'sensitive content' [Abstract] [0010-0012] [Figs. 8, 10, 11 & 12]. Specifically, Spies discloses the additionally recited features of the method further comprising the computer system attempting to process the new message, and logging state information indicating that the message successfully processed only in response to the new message completing successfully (Spies: e.g., 'type' of Processed Message => message is 'Acceptable' / 'unacceptable'_160) (e.g., blocking / editing and archiving of the 'processed message', and generating any alerts / notifications) [Fig. 8, 10, 11 & 12].

It would thus be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the combination of Smith and Gilbert with the above said additional features, as disclosed by Spies, for the motivation of providing a message management system with the ability to handle encrypted messages, as well as methods for using such systems to manage the messages [0009-010].

Additionally, while the combination of Smith, Gilbert and Spies discloses substantial features of the invention such as the method of claim 1 above, the additionally recited feature of the method further comprising generating an identifier for the message is disclosed by Callas in a related endeavor.

Callas discloses as his invention a method and system of processing of messages in an electronic network; in particular, in relation to efficient techniques for the partial authentication of messages exchanged in an electronic network [Abstract] [0042]. Specifically, Callas discloses the additionally recited feature of the method further comprising generating an identifier for the message (e.g., 'message-id') [0048]

It would thus be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the combination of Smith, Gilbert and Spies with the added feature of the method further comprising generating an identifier for the message, as disclosed by Callas, for the motivation of providing a method and system for inserting partial authentication content into a message which allows processing of the authentication content without processing the entire message [Abstract].

Conclusion

1. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office Action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** See MPEP 706.06(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

2. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Glenford Madamba whose telephone number is 571-272-7989. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Valencia Wallace Martin can be reached on 571-272-3440. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/John Follansbee/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2451

Glenford Madamba
Examiner
Art Unit 2451